REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, independent claims 1 and 12 are amended to recite that the active and non-active pixels contain different printing information for a printer. See the specification at, for example, page 6, lines 18-22. Claim 21 is amended to obviate an informality. New claims 22-24 are added to recite additional features disclosed in the specification. See the specification at, for example, page 3, lines 26-28; and page 6, line 30-page 7, line 2. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks Examiner Coles and Rahimi for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative, Mr. Luo, during the July 20, 2004 personal interview. The substance of the personal interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

The Office Action objects to claim 21. Claim 21 is amended. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 21 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 6, 9, 10-13, 20 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,077,806 to Peters et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts that Peters discloses every element recited in claims 1, 2, 6, 9-13, 20 and 21. Applicant respectfully submits that Peters does not disclose a pixel counter that selectively reads image data from data bus and generates a pixel count based on active pixels, wherein the active and non-active pixels contain different printing information for a printer, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 12.

As discussed during the interview, Peters discloses a video camera that converts digital data to analog data. See col. 2, lines 45-56. A window comparator unit 40 decides whether a pixel is ON or OFF based on a threshold. See Figs. 1 and 2, and col. 3, lines 31-39.

A pixel counting unit 60 counts the occurrences of the ON pixels from the window comparator unit 40. See col. 3, line 53 - col. 4, line 2.

Applicant respectfully submits that Peters discloses ON or OFF pixels having values above or below a threshold. Peters does not disclose active and non-active pixels containing different printing information for a printer, as recited in claims 1 and 12.

In addition, as discussed during the interview, Peters discloses that the pixel counting unit counts the occurrences of ON pixels from the window comparator unit. Peters does not disclose that the pixel counting unit reads the ON pixels from data bus. Thus, Peters does not disclose a pixel counter that selectively reads image data from data bus, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claim 12.

For any of the above reasons, Peters does not disclose each and every element recited in claims 1 and 12. Thus, Peters does not anticipate the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 12.

Claims 2, 6, 9-11 and 13 are each patentable over Peters by virtue of their dependency upon claims 1 and 12, as well as for the additional features they recite.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 9-13 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 3-5, 14 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Peters in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,287,452 to Newman. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Newman discloses a display system for connection to a data bus in a digital processing system including a system memory. See col. 2, lines 6-8. Newman is not directed to printers, and does not disclose or suggest active and non-active pixels that contain different printing

information for printers. In addition, Newman does not disclose selectively reading image data from data bus. Therefore, Newman does not supply the subject matter lacking in Peters.

For any of the above reasons, Peters and Newman, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 12, or of claims 3-5, 14 and 17-19 depending from claims 1 and 12, respectively. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3-5, 14 and 17-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Peters in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,145,947 to Inora et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Inora discloses dividing print data into clot blocks each having a predetermined dot matrix. See Fig. 5, and col. 5, lines 19-30. Inora discloses searching the blocks for an effective block that includes data indicating at least one ejection nozzle to count effective blocks. Inora does not disclose or suggest counting active pixels, which contain printing information. Furthermore, nowhere does Inora disclose or suggest reading the blocks from a data bus.

For any of the above reasons, Inora does not supply the subject matter lacking in Peters. Thus, Peters and Inora, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 12, or of claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 depending from claims 1 and 12, respectively. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7, 8, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

New claims 22-24 are believed to be patentable by virtue of their dependency on claims 1 and 12, respectively, as well as for the additional features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-24 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/sqb

Date: August 2, 2004

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 24-0037